IRB Meeting, March 25, 2009  
Mississippi Room, Pioneer Student Center, 3pm  
Minutes

Present:
IRB Members: Barb Barnet, Chair, PB Ravikumar, Steven Benish, Joan Riedle, Yuanyuan Hu, Irfan Ul-Haq, Dee Bernhardt, Kathy Lomax, Vickie Dreesens and Jill Clough  
Absent: Chanaka Mendis, Amanda Trewin

1. Minutes 1/21/09 
Minutes were reviewed and approved.

2. News & Announcements  
a. Current Protocol Update: 44 protocols have been received, of those 40 have been completed, 3 are being revised and 1 is being reviewed.  
b. Review of IRB Training in February – Those who attended found the training very helpful. Kathy Lomax has packets for those who did not attend. The packet includes a CD to read & review selectively for topics.

3. Revisions  
a. Changes to memo from Chair to IRB members for expedited review – We need to change the wording on our memo because only the full board can disapprove a protocol. Barb will change the wording.

b. Letter to researcher when protocol is approved – In response to information received at the training, Barb prepared a packet of sample memos for the Board to review. She recommends that we include several changes:
   1) list dates of approval and expiration – must be one full year (per Federal guidelines);  
   2) lists of conditions that need to be met;  
   3) within the manual, a section on how continuations (beyond the full year of approval) are to be handled;  
   4) reminder to researchers to treat data with respect.

A discussion commenced about the strict Federal guidelines about the one-year window. Considerations included “project” versus “data collection”, staggered studies, and current practice, and several members asserted that our role is more to provide oversight in the area of data collection. The group also discussed when approval for continuation is necessary around identifiable versus unidentifiable data. **All will review this information, and we will vote for approval next meeting.

c. Member Handbook  
Barb made the edits from our last meeting. She remarked that at least one non-scientific member must be present for full-board quorum. Yuan and Vickie are definitely non-scientific. Dee may qualify as non-scientific. She also pointed out that the Board may invite outside consultants, but that they may not stay for the approval vote.

We discussed how to handle conflicts of interest and what constitutes conflicts of interest. According to guidelines, any such conflict must be reflected in the minutes. Barb will add “other potential conflicts” to the list.
Steve Benish made a flow chart of the review and approval process for protocols. Due to the necessity for full board review if expedited review fails to approve, he will redo it for our next meeting.

Barb will remove the header from the checklist, since the header is included in the memo that asks the Board to review protocols.

All thanked Barb for her excellent work on the handbook.

d. Other Changes
1) We need to include procedures for non-compliance. Perhaps some wording like, “this will be sent to the Provost for follow-up” or “your protocol has been forwarded to the UWP Legal Department.” We will discuss this further at a future meeting.
2) The language in the manual will be changed from “research” to “covered research” or “human subjects’ research.”
3) On consent forms, “research” required to provide for consistency.
4) There must be a way to spell check for forms.
5) Perhaps we should add provision for electronic submission. Researchers will still need to provide a hard copy with signatures. Individuals can sign with “freeform draw” in Word, if necessary. They can submit the body electronically with a scanned cover sheet and the original to follow.

4. Adjournment
Irfan motioned and Steve seconded. Meeting was adjourned.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Dee Bernhardt, April 14, 2009.